

Appl. No. 10/684,686
Amdt. dated June 27, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 3, 2006

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed April 23, 2006. Claims 1-6, 10-13, 15, 16, 18-24, 26, and 28-36 were pending in the present application. Claims 1-5, 10-13, 15, 16, 18-20, and 30-34 are allowed. This Amendment amends claims 6, 21, 22, 24, 26, and 29, without canceling or adding any claims, leaving pending in the application claims 1-6, 10-13, 15, 16, 18-24, 26, and 28-36. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

I. Allowed Claims

Claims 1-5, 10-13, 15, 16, 18-20, and 30-34 are allowed.

II. Allowable Claims

Claims 22 and 35-36 are objected to as depending from a rejected base claim. Applicants respectfully submit that the respective base claims are in condition for allowance, as discussed below, such that these claims are also in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the objections be withdrawn.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, and in particular for being re-written in independent and failing to incorporate the limitation of claim 5. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's helpful suggestion, and have amended claim 6 to recite the limitation of claim 5. As claim 6 was previously determined to be allowable, the claim now should be in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 21, 23-24, 26, and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Fortman* (US 6,594,349) in view of *Tunncliffe* (US 6,055,240). Applicants

Appl. No. 10/684,686
Amdt. dated June 27, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 3, 2006

PATENT

respectfully submit that *Fortman* and *Tunncliffe* do not teach or suggest each element of these claims.

In the Office Action on Page 2, the Examiner provides the helpful suggestion that claims 21 and 26 recite "one or more device types," such that one device type would meet the limitations, and the claims might find a more favorable outcome if amended to recite more than one device type. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's suggestion, and have amended claims 21 and 26 to recite a "plurality of device types." As neither *Fortman* nor *Tunncliffe* teach or suggest determining a device type from a plurality of device types associated with a second user using an identifier as recited in claims 21 and 26, claims 21 and 26, and dependent claims 22-24 and 28-29, should be in condition for allowance.

V. Amendment to the Claims

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the specification and do not add new matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,



Jason D. Iohr
Reg. No. 48,163

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200 / Fax: 415-576-0300
JDL:jdl / 60807316 v1